DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 008 CS 508 414

AUTHOR Huebner, Thomas M., Jr.
TITLE Formula X: The Search for the Equitable Sweepstakes Tabulation Methodology.
PUB DATE 18 Nov 93
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (79th, Miami, FL, November 18-21, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *College Students; *Debate; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Models; *Speech Curriculum; *Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Debate Tournaments; Missouri

ABSTRACT

Perhaps one of the greatest challenges facing tournament directors wishing to provide a balance between individual events and debate is an equitable overall sweepstakes formula. One such formula, modified from a methodology initially developed in response to a need at the Missouri Association of Forensic Activities (MAFA) intercollegiate tournament, is based on a percentage system. The formula is constructed on five main premises: quick tabulation; recognition of squad achievement; attempt at equity within debate as well as within individual events; equitable weighting between debate and individual events; and "maximum entry possible" as a reasonable goal. The formula was applied to a moderately-sized regional-draw invitational tournament. In terms of overall sweepstakes, this particular tournament had no changes in the final rankings of its competing squads after re-tabulation using the modified MAFA formula, although a few changes occurred in individual events rankings. Whether or not this particular formula is worthy of wide-spread use remains to be seen: however, those who have used the methodology believe that it is a progressive step in the right direction. The methodology for scoring and the complete retabulation data (presented in numerous unnumbered tables) are included. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 008

Formula X: The Search for the Equitable Sweepstakes Tabulation Methodology

Thomas M. Huebner, Jr.

Southwest Baptist University

Bolivar, Missouri

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Huebner, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS508414

SCA November 18, 1993

Miami, Florida

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Formula X: The Search for the Equitable Sweepstakes Tabulation Methodology[1]

Perhaps one of the greatest challenges facing tournament directors wishing to provide a balance between individual events and debate is an equitable overall sweepstakes formula. Programs that focus on debate competition are often heard complaining that their division takes a numerical backseat to the eleven AFA events, numerous experimental competitions, and the large number of points assigned for a first place victory in each. Likewise, it is not uncommon, at certain tournaments, for individual events scholars to feel as if their efforts are futile against a system that allows virtually unlimited debate entries while greatly restricting the number of persons allowed to compete in individual events. The purpose of this paper is to suggest an overall sweepstakes formula that provides a balance between individual events and debate. After a discussion of the formula, we will re-tabulate an actual tournament in an attempt to determine if it, indeed, meets its objective of providing a more balanced approach to overall sweepstakes award tabulation.

The Modified MAFA Sweepstakes Methodology

The formula, which is modified from a methodology initially developed in response to a need at the Missouri Association of Forensic Activities (MAFA) intercollegiate tournament, is based on a percentage system. In essence, each activity--debate as well as individual events--is given equal weighting in the final determination of rank. Debate points, for example, are converted from a percentage system to equal a possible 100 points. Individual events are calculated similarly. Thus, every tournament wishing to offer an overall sweepstakes award can claim that both debate and individual events have been given equal consideration.

Although this formula seems rather complicated initially, it is constructed on five main premises. First, and most practically, the method must be simple enough to tabulate quickly. Second, it must recognize squad achievement. Third, the formula needs to attempt equity within debate as well as within individual events; though it goes beyond the expressed purpose of the formula, it must attempt to be fair for those wishing to do debate or individual events only. Fourth, the procedure must achieve an equitable

weighting between debate and individual events thus rewarding the truly balanced squad. Fifth, the formula needs to make the "maximum entry possible" a reasonable goal. With these precepts in mind, I suggest the following methodology for tabulating sweepstakes at tournaments offering both individual events and debate:

Debate

1. 6 points will be given for each team debate victory in preliminary rounds.
2. 3 points will be given for each Lincoln-Douglas victory in preliminary rounds.
3. 12 points will be given for each two-person debate team advancing to elimination rounds.
4. 6 points will be given for each Lincoln-Douglas debater advancing to elimination rounds.
5. The top five teams from each squad count toward sweepstakes.
6. Two Lincoln-Douglas competitors are equal to one two-person debate team.
7. Debate sweepstakes is determined based on total points derived using the above-mentioned system.
8. Tie-breakers:
   a. Number of teams in elimination rounds
   b. Total number of speaker points for top five teams.
   c. Total number of teams in tournament.
9. Overall sweepstakes: The "percentage" system is calculated based on the following procedures.
   a. The tabulator determines the total number of points achievable by each squad. That number is always 240 points--based on 5 teams x 6 preliminary rounds x 6 points per victory for preliminary rounds + 12 points per team breaking to elimination rounds x 5 teams. Consider: 5(36) + 12(5) = 240.

b. Each squad's achieved points are divided by the total number of achievable points. Squad A, for example, might have completed the tournament with 138 debate points. When the tabulator divides 138 (achieved points) by 240 (achievable points) it will be decided that Squad A has earned 57.5%[2] of the total number of possible debate points available to that squad.

c. The determined percentage will be converted to points out of 100. Hence, the above-mentioned Squad A will receive 57.5 overall sweepstakes points.

Individual Events:

1. Students in preliminary rounds of competition will receive the following rankings based on their performance:
   a. A preliminary round ranking of "1" will receive 3 points.
   b. A preliminary round ranking of "2" will receive 2 points.
   c. A preliminary round ranking of "3" will receive 1 point.
2. Each student in semi-final rounds of competition will receive 1 point regardless of ranking.
3. Students in final rounds of competition will receive the following rankings based on their performance:
   a. A cumulative final round ranking of "1" will receive 6 points.
   b. A cumulative final round ranking of "2" will receive 5 points.
   c. A cumulative final round ranking of "3" will receive 4 points.
   d. A cumulative final round ranking of "4" will receive 3 points.
   e. A cumulative final round ranking of "5" will receive 2 points.
   f. A cumulative final round ranking of "6" or lower will receive 1 point.
4. The top four competitors in each event from each squad count toward sweepstakes.

5. Individual Events sweepstakes is determined based on total points using the above-mentioned system.

6. Tie-breakers:

   a. Total number of first-place victories.

   b. Total number of competitors in final rounds.

   c. Total number of breaks (including semi-finals).

   d. Total number of entries.

7. Overall sweepstakes: The "percentage" system is calculated based on the following procedures.

   a. The tabulator determines the total number of points achievable by each squad. If the tournament has at least 4 sections, 11 events, semi-finals and finals, there are a possible total of 506 sweepstakes points. [**3** (top preliminary rank) x **4** (number of sections) x **11** (number of events) x **2** (number of preliminary rounds] + [**1** (semi-final point) x **4** (number of people breaking from a particular school) x **11** (number of events)] + [**6** ("1" rank) + **5** ("2" rank) + **4** ("3" rank) + **3** ("4" rank) x **11** (total number of finals events)] = **506**. Consider: $2(11[3(4)]) + 11[1(4)] + 11(6+5+4+3) = 506$.[3]

   b. Each squad's achieved points are divided by the total number of achievable points. Squad A, for example, might have completed the individual events tournament with 300 points. When the tabulator divides 300 (achieved points) by 506 (achievable points at a particular tournament) it will be decided that Squad A has earned 59.2% of the total number of possible individual events points available to that squad.

c. The determined percentage will be converted to possible points out of 100. Hence, the above-mentioned Squad A will receive 59.2 overall sweepstakes points.

Combined Sweepstakes

The total number of debate points out of 100 plus the total number of individual events points out of 100 will give each team a total number of sweepstakes points out of 200. The above-mentioned Squad A, for example, finished with 57.5 debate points and 59.2 individual events points and a total of 116.7 sweepstakes points.

Admittedly, there is no truly equitable formula because debate is inherently different than individual events. Each is judged using different criteria, requires distinct kinds of preparation, and encourages dissimilar methods of delivery and audience adaptation. These differences are an obvious problem for those who tabulate tournament results. Many formulas, for example, reward debaters for their successes in preliminary rounds and individual events competitors are given points for placing in final rounds. The modified MAFA formula attempts to alleviate these problems.

Application

In an effort to test the modified MAFA methodology, it has been applied to a moderately sized regional-draw invitational tournament. A complete copy of the grids have been included to ensure accuracy.

Brief Description

16 Total schools in competition

13 Schools in debate competition

13 Schools in individual events competition

11 Schools qualify for overall sweepstakes

165 individual events slots filled

20 Lincoln-Douglas CEDA debaters

15 Novice CEDA debate teams

11 Open CEDA debate teams

420 achievable individual event points

240 achievable debate points

Debate Sweepstakes

Original Formula:

1. 5 points for team-debate win
2. 2.5 points for Lincoln-Douglas win
3. Top four debate teams count toward sweepstakes.
4. Two Lincoln-Douglas debaters are equal to one team.
5. 1st debate speaker earns 5 points; 2nd speaker earns 3 points; 3rd speaker earns 2 points.

Original Tabulation: (*=break)("1","2","3" =speaker awards)

Open CEDA

Team	Record	Combined Points
3A	5-1	320* (1,2)
3B	3-3	265
5A	1-5	263
5B	1-5	246
5C	1-5	295
8A	4-2	266
11A	4-2	297*
14A	3-3	291

14B	5-1	256*
15A	4-2	285
16A	5-1	304* (3)

Novice CEDA

Team	Record	Combined Points
2A	5-1	285*
2B	5-1	318* (1,3)
3A	1-5	229
3B	6-0	277*
7A	2-4	250
7B	4-2	210
8A	1-5	212
8B	2-4	234
8C	5-1	276
8D	5-1	287*
9A	1-5	229
11A	2-4	268
11B	4-2	292
15A	2-4	256
16A	3-3	296 (2)

Lincoln-Douglas CEDA

Team	Record	Points
1A	3-3	154
2A	2-4	136
2B	4-2	155*
3A	0-6	136
6A	3-3	146
6B	3-3	146
7A	3-3	153
7B	4-2	152*
8A	6-0	162*
9A	2-4	152
9B	1-5	146
9C	1-5	150
11A	4-2	151*
11B	0-6	130
13A	2-4	128
14A	6-0	155*
14B	5-1	165*
14C	5-1	155*

14D	4-2	147*
16A	2-4	136

Retabulation: (original points)

School	Points	Tie-Brk	%	Original	New
1	9 (7.5)		.038		
2	108 (72)		.450	4th	4th
3	114 (83)		.475	3rd	3rd
5	18 (15)		.075		
6	18 (17.5)		.075		
7	63 (47.5)		.263		
8	120 (85)		.500	2nd	2nd
9	18 (10)		.075		
11	90 (60)		.375	5th	5th
12	6 (5)		.025		
14	144 (90)		.600	1st	1st
15	36 (30)		.150		
16	54 (55)		.225		

Individual Events Sweepstakes

Original Formula:

1. First place finish in finals round earns 10 points.

2. Second place finish in finals round earns 7 points.

3. Third place finish in finals round earns 5 points.

4. Other finalists earn 2 points.

Original Tabulation:

Impromptu

School	Round I	Round II	Finals
1A	3-20	3-22	
3A	4-14	5-17	
3B	1-20	3-23	6th
3C	4-20	4-15	
4A	5-16	3-19	
7A	5-18	5-11	
7B	5-8	5-19	
7C	5-10	5-16	
7D	2-21	4-17	
8A	4-17	2-24	
9A	1-22	5-21	
9B	3-16	5-15	
9C	3-17	2-19	
9D	5-19	1-23	
11A	2-20	4-22	
11B	2-21	2-21	5th
11C	5-10	5-14	
11D	2-19	1-25	4th
11E	3-20	3-19	

13A	3-18	1-23	2nd
14A	1-22	1-22	1st
14B	4-16	2-22	
14C	1-22	2-21	3rd
14D	1-22	4-22	
14E	4-19	1-23	
15A	2-18	5-22	
16A	5-11	4-18	

Extemporaneous

School	Round I	Round II	Finals
1A	5-18	1-25	6th
3A	5-14	5-21	
3B	4-15	5-21	
9A	2-22	4-21	3rd
9B	3-16	4-18	
11A	3-19	5-20	
11B	4-19	3-22	
11C	4-15	3-22	
11D	5-14	3-20	
11E	5-15	5-15	

14A	1-23	2-23	2nd
14B	2-19	1-23	5th
14C	1-23	2-24	1st
14D	3-21	1-23	
14E	1-23	2-22	4th
15A	2-20	4-21	

Duo Interpretation

School	Round I	Round II	Finals
2A	5-20	5-11	
3A	5-23	3-17	
3B	4-20	5-14	
3C	4-23	5-14	
4A	2-23	3-18	4th
8A	3-24	2-19	5th
9A	3-23	4-15	
14A	1-25	1-19	3rd
14B	1-25	2-21	2nd
14C	2-24	1-23	1st
15A	5-19	4-15	

Poetry Interpretation

School	Round I	Round II	Finals

3A 3B	1-23 2-23	1-20 2-21	6th 3rd
4A 4B	5-19 1-24	4-20 4-20	 4th
8A 8B 8C	3-21 1-24 3-22	5-19 2-23 5-16	 2nd
9A 9B	5-19 4-20	5-15 3-21	
11A 11B 11C	4-21 5-19 5-16	3-21 5-19 4-16	
12A	5-22	2-20	
13A	2-22	1-24	5th
14A 14B	3-21 5-21	1-23 5-19	1st
15A	4-19	5-16	
16A	2-22	3-19	

Prose Interpretation

School	Round I	Round II	Finals
1A	5-18	4-22	

3A	2-23	5-20	
3B	3-19	1-21	1st
3C	2-24	1-25	3rd
4A	1-25	2-24	2nd
4B	4-21	3-20	
4C	2-20	5-18	
8A	4-21	1-25	
8B	5-15	ns	
9A	ns	3-23	
9B	5-16	4-19	
9C	5-20	4-18	
9D	2-25	5-20	
11A	1-24	2-19	6th
11B	5-17	4-21	
12A	1-25	2-21	5th
14A	4-20	5-18	
14B	5-16	5-20	
14C	4-18	2-24	
14D	5-20	5-22	
14E	3-24	5-18	
15A	3-23	3-23	
16A	1-21	1-23	4th
16B	3-22	3-18	

Communication Analysis

School	Round I	Round II	Finals

3A	4-19	5-20	
9A	3-15	1-23	4th
11A	ns	4-20	
11B	5-11	ns	
11C	3-21	3-20	
14A	4-15	1-22	1st
14B	2-22	3-21	5th
14C	2-18	2-22	2nd
14D	1-23	2-21	3rd
14E	1-19	4-18	

Dramatic Interpretation

School	Round I	Round II	Finals
3A	3-17	2-23	
3B	4-21	5-14	
3C	3-21	1-25	3rd
4A	5-16	2-25	
8A	5-20	3-21	
9A	5-19	5-19	
9B	1-19	3-18	2nd
9C	2-22	3-22	6th
9D	1-22	4-15	
11A	5-13	5-12	
12A	3-21	2-19	

14A	4-20	1-22	1st
14B	2-18	1-24	5th
14C	1-23	4-21	4th
14D	2-21	4-20	
15A	4-17	5-18	

Persuasive

School	Round I	Round II	Finals
1A	5-15	2-23	
2A	3-19	3-15	
2B	5-12	4-6	
8A	4-19	ns	
9A	5-15	5-11	
11A	2-22	3-20	6th
11B	2-21	3-17	
11C	2-19	ns	
11D	4-19	4-10	
14A	3-20	1-24	3rd
14B	4-19	1-22	
14C	3-20	1-21	5th
14D	1-23	2-20	2nd
14E	1-20	2-19	1st
16A	1-24	4-14	4th

Informative

School	Round I	Round II	Finals
3A	5-13	5-5	
4A	2-21	5-18	
4B	5-11	5-17	
7A	4-15	4-10	
9A	5-15	3-21	
9B	3-21	3-20	
11A	2-21	4-20	
11B	3-17	3-10	
13A	2-22	2-15	1st
13B	4-17	4-20	
14A	1-22	1-25	3rd
14B	1-23	1-19	4th
14C	4-19	2-24	2nd
14D	3-20	1-24	5th
16A	1-24	2-22	6th

After Dinner Speaking (Determined on 4 preliminary ballots)

School	Round I	Round II	Finals
3A	5-14.5	5-21	6th
4A	6-15	3-22	5th
8A	4-17	2-23	2nd

9A	7-13.5	7-19.5	7th
11A	3-17	6-19.5	4th
14A 14B	2-17.5 1-21	4-21.5 1-24	3rd 1st

Program Oral Interp. (Determined on 4 Prelim. ballots)

School	Round I	Round II	Finals
4A 4B	5-20 6-23	7-18 5-19.5	7th 5th
12A	4-22.5	4-21	2nd
13A	3-22.5	1-23.5	1st
14A 14B 14C	1-24 6-19 7-18.5	6-19 3-22 2-22.5	3rd 6th 4t

Retabulation:

#	Imp	Dra	Ext	Poe	Pro	EA	Int	Per	Ind	ADS	POI	Tot	%	Orig	New
1	2		4					2				8	019		
2		0				0		2				2	002		
3	5	1		15	21		11			1		54	...129	2	2
4	1	6		6	13		2		2	3	4	38	...090	5	5
7	2											2	002		
8	2	5		12	3		1			7		30	071	6	7

Formula X
20

9	10	1	7	1	2	7	16		3	1		48	.114	4	4
11	18		4	1	6	2		9	4	5		49	.117	7	3
12				2	7		3				5	17	.040		
13	10			5					10		10	35	.083	3	6
14	27	31	36	10	3	32	24	35	32	17	14	261	.621	1	1
15	2		2		2							6	.014		
16				3	11				1			15	.035		

Overall Sweepstakes

Original Formula: Total number of debate and individual events points.

Retabulation:

School	IE Total	Dbt Total	Ttl(200)	Original	New
1	.09	.038	.057		
2	.002	.450	.452	5th	5th
3	.129	.475	.604		
7	.002	.263	.265		
8	.071	.500	.571	3rd	3rd
9	.114	.075	.189		
11	.117	.375	.492	4th	4th
13	.083	.050	.133		
14	.621	.600	1.221	1st	1st
15	.014	.150	.164		

16	.050	.225	.275	6th	6th

Conclusion

In terms of overall sweepstakes, this particular tournament had no changes in the final rankings of its competing squads after re-tabulation using the modified MAFA formula. There were, however, a few changes in the individual events sweepstakes rankings (school 8 from 6th to 7th, school 11 from 7th to 3rd, and school 13 from 3rd to 6th), which might indicate overall team strength as opposed to success only in final rounds. It is possible that overall rankings remained the same because most squads in attendance had fairly balanced debate and individual events entries and that all were consistently competitive. It is also possible that the point margins between each place were significant enough to make weighting scores inconsequential. Other tournaments that have been re-tabulated have produced varying results.[4]

Whether or not this particular methodology is worthy of wide-spread use remains to be seen. Because of the differences between individual events and debate it is difficult to say whether or not it is even feasible to consider a balanced system. Those of us who have utilized this particular methodology, however, believe that it is a progressive step in the right direction.

Notes

1. The idea for this paper originated with Jeff Pryzbola of Northwest Missouri State University who suggested using a percentage method during a brainstorming session at the 1992 fall meeting of the Missouri Association of Forensic Activities (MAFA). It was further developed by Harold Lawson of Central Missouri State University who, as president of MAFA, appointed a committee that attempted to find an equitable system for its state tournament. Jack Hart, of Northeast Missouri State University, Tom Preston, of the University of Missouri at St. Louis, Scott Jensen, now of McNeese State University, Sean Behymer, now of the University of Missouri School of Law, and, I am sure, many others, provided input on the original "Percentage" formula. All of these individuals deserve as much credit as I.

2. I have determined that, based on my applications, carrying numbers out longer than three percentage points has little, if any, overall effect on outcomes. However, since poor debate showings by competing schools are not uncommon, numbers must be carried at least three places in an effort to include as many squads as possible on the final rankings.

3. It is important to note that "achievable" means that a squad which chooses to enter the maximum number of entries has the possibility of earning these points. If a squad is allowed to bring four dramatic interpretations, for example, but there are only enough total entries in the tournament to have two sections then the total number of preliminary points possible for that squad in dramatic interpretation change from 24 to 20. 3 ("1" rank") x 4 (number of sections) x 2 (number of rounds) = 24; 3 ("1" rank) x 2 (number of sections) + 2 ("2" rank) x 2 (number of sections) all x 2 (number of rounds) = 20.

4. This is not always the case, however. The 1992 MAFA tournament indicated a switch in 3rd and 4th places and the following final re-tabulation grid from a large, midwestern invitational tournament shows some change.

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	.074	.125	.199		
[illegible]	.004	.275	.279		

9	.043	.575	.618	3rd	3rd
10	.201	.275	.476	2nd	4th
12	.018	.400	.418		
15	.082	.100	.182		
21	0	.050	.050		
28	.030	.175	.205		
30	.090	.250	.340		
34	.053	.417	.470	5th	5th
32	0	.300	.300		
36	.199	.450	.649	1st	1st
38	.002	0	.002		
37	.080	.150	.230		
39	.055	.025	.080		
41	.084	.250	.334		
45	.014	.088	.102		
47	.032	.125	.157		
49	.012	.125	.137		
50	.008	.625	.633	4th	2nd

BEST COPY AVAILABLE